

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 40-58 and 60 were pending in the application, of which Claims 40, 50 and 60 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 23, 2008, Claims 40-58 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 40, 43-50, 53-58 and 60 remain in this application with Claims 41-42 and 51-52 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Basom for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 2, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the claims as currently amended. In agreement, the Examiner stated that the amendments overcome the cited art, but that an updated search would be necessary. No agreement regarding patentability was reached.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated January 23, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 40 and 45-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,361,361 ("Hickman") in view of what the Examiner considers to be Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and "Managing On-line Help in a Networked Multi-Platform

Environment" ("*Irwin*"). In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 50 and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hickman* in view of what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *Irwin*, and "Portable Document Format Reference Manual, Version 1.2" ("PDF Reference Manual"). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected Claim 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hickman* in view of what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *Irwin*, PDF Reference Manual, U.S. Patent No. 6,236,989 ("Mandyam"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,825,356 ("Habib"). Claims 40, 50 and 60 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome these rejections and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 40 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein the script library objects are operative to perform at least one of the following: collect system operation information, and upload the system operation information to a vendor associated with the script library object." Amended Claims 50 and 60 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found at least on page 21, line 13–page 23, line 12.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Hickman*, what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *Irwin*, PDF Reference Manual, and Mandyam do not teach a script library for storing script library objects used by help contents. (See Office Action page 26, lines 17-20.) Accordingly, at least because the aforementioned references do not teach a script library for storing script library objects, they cannot teach a script library storing script library objects operative to collect various system operation information and upload such information to a vendor. Consequently, *Hickman*, what the

Examiner considers to be AAPA, *Irwin, PDF Reference Manual*, and *Mandyam* can not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation from Claim 40.

Furthermore, *Habib* does not overcome *Hickman's*, what the Examiner considers to be AAPA's, *Irwin's, PDF Reference Manual's*, and *Mandyam's* deficiencies. For example, *Habib* merely discloses that when a help program is told to execute a script, it will first search catalog files for a script with .SBX (pre-compiled) appended to it. (See col. 13, lines 49-51) If *Habib* does not find the script, it will search for the same file but with a .SBL extension (un-compiled) appended to it. (See col. 13, lines 51-53) If *Habib* still does not find the file, it will look for the .SBL file in the Script directory. (See col. 13, lines 53-54) Nowhere in *Habib* does it teach or suggest a script library object obtaining system information and uploading the system information to a vendor associated with the script library object. Rather *Habib* merely discloses a deficient script execution process lacking system information retrieval and uploading the system information to a vendor associated with the script library object.

Combining *Hickman* with what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *Irwin, PDF Reference Manual, Mandyam*, and *Habib* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Hickman*, what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *Irwin, PDF Reference Manual, Mandyam*, and *Habib*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "wherein the script library objects are operative to perform at least one of the following: collect system operation information, and upload the system operation information to a vendor associated with the script library object," as recited by amended Claim 40. Amended Claims 50 and 60 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 40, 50 and 60 each patentably distinguishes the

present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of Claims 40, 50 and 60.

Dependent Claims 43-49 and 53-58 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 40 and 50, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 40 and 50. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 43-49 and 53-58.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and
charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: April 23, 2008

/D. Kent Stier/

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE